



As Nunnery points out, this court has granted COVID-related investigation stays in at least two other cases.<sup>6</sup> Unlike this case, however, the petitioners in those cases have not been sentenced to death so presumably do not have an incentive to keep their federal habeas proceedings pending as long as possible. Indeed, the Supreme Court cautioned in *Rhines v. Weber* that, “[i]n particular, capital petitioners might deliberately engage in dilatory tactics to prolong their incarceration and avoid execution of the sentence of death.”<sup>7</sup> Nonetheless, the court agrees that the current limitations imposed in response to the COVID-19 pandemic are a significant obstacle to counsel’s ability to investigate his case and prepare a proper amended petition. So the court will grant the stay but require petitioner’s counsel to file quarterly status reports advising the court of counsel’s efforts to complete the investigation. Petitioner must return to this court with a motion to reopen the case when counsel concludes the investigation necessary to file an amended petition. In granting this stay, the court makes no assurances about the timeliness of any claims contained in the amended petition. To the extent that respondents are concerned that Nunnery is unnecessarily prolonging the stay, they may file a response to any such status report.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **petitioner’s motion for stay [ECF No. 15] is GRANTED. This action is STAYED until further order.**

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner must file a status report describing the status of his investigation by December 15, 2020, and then every three months while the stay continues (i.e., on or before March 15, 2021; June 15, 2021; etc.). The respondents may, if necessary, file

---

<sup>6</sup> ECF No. 15 at 11 n.46 (citing *Campbell v. Williams*, No. 2:19-cv-01374-GMN-EY (D. Nev. May 18, 2020), ECF No. 18 and *Ojeda-Enriquez v. Warden*, No. 2:18-cv-01207-RFB-VCF (D. Nev. July 13, 2020), ECF No. 31).

<sup>7</sup> *Rhines v. Weber*, 544 U.S. 269, 277–78 (2005).

1 a response to any such status report within 15 days after it is filed. If necessary, petitioner may  
2 reply within 15 days of the filing of the response.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk is directed to **ADMINISTRATIVELY**  
4 **CLOSE this action.**

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action will be subject to dismissal upon a motion  
6 by the respondents if petitioner does not comply with the time limits in this order or if he  
7 otherwise fails to proceed with diligence during the stay imposed under this order.

8 Dated: August 24, 2020

9   
10 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23